DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 487 EA 025 967

TITLE	Public Hearing, National Education Commission on Time and Learning Highlights (5th, Ypsilanti, Michigan, April 28-30, 1993).
INSTITUTION	National Education Commission on Time and Learning, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	23p.; For a briefing paper, related hearings, and research findings, see EA 025 962-971.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Catholic Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Hearings; Instructional Improvement; *Professional Development; *School Restructuring; Teacher Improvement; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS	*National Education Commission on Time and Learning

ABSTRACT

The National Education Commission on Time and Learning (NECT&L) is an independent advisory body, authorized by the United States Congress through Public Law 102-62, the Education Council Act of 1991. The commission is undertaking a comprehensive review of the relationship between time and learning in elementary-secondary education, including international comparisons, the use of time in and out of school, the use of facilities, year-round professional opportunities for teachers, and the estimated costs of adopting longer school days and longer school years. This document summarizes proceedings of a hearing to discuss the professional development of teachers. Themes that emerged during the discussions included time management, school restructuring, professional development schools, and the human dimension. A list of participants is included. The appendix describes a site visit to Cornerstone School, an interdenominational religious school administered by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit (Michigan). (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 487

EA

HIGHLIGHTS

of the

FIFTH PUBLIC HEARING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMISSION ON TIME AND LEARNING

Ypsilanti, Michigan
April 28-30, 1993

EA 025 967

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREFACE

How can schools help *all* children succeed? With more time available for learning, will educators do more of the same or organize learning differently? What do families think of different school calendars? Who decides best how to incorporate technology into new visions of learning organized around systemic change? What impact will changing the time involved in schooling create on how we prepare teachers for their profession and on how they develop their own skills as teachers? These questions and others challenged the members of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning (NECTL) and its guests at a two-day visit to Ypsilanti, Michigan on April 28-30, 1993. The visit included two public hearings and a site visit to Cornerstone School. The following pages summarize those events. The testimony of individual witness is also available to the public.

NECTL is an independent advisory body, authorized by the U.S. Congress in Public Law 102-62, the Education Council Act of 1992. Its members—appointed by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives—are to present a report to Congress and the Secretary of Education by April, 1994. The Commission has been asked to make a comprehensive review of the relationship between time and learning in elementary and secondary education, including international comparisons, the use of time in- and out-of-school, the use of facilities, year-round professional opportunities for teachers, and the estimated costs of adopting longer school days and longer school years.

The Ypsilanti public hearings are part of a series of hearings and site-based visits scheduled by the Commission as part of its fact-finding efforts. This Summary has been prepared to respond to numerous public requests for information on the progress of the Commission's work. Copies of the complete testimony of individual witnesses are available from the Commission's office.

Milton Goldberg
Executive Director

ACTIVITIES AND WITNESSES

On April 29, 1993, the National Education Commission on Time and Learning visited the Cornerstone School, an interdenominational religious school administered by the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit (see p. XX). The Commission also held a local hearing on the topic of Professional Development for Teachers and received testimony from the following individuals:

Local Hearing Witnesses

Ms. Valerie Mills
Teacher
Ypsilanti Public Schools

Carol Polkinghorn
Instructional Leader
Greensburg Salem (Pa.) School District
Member, National Education Association Time Commission

Ms. Sharon Ryles
Teacher
Willow Run Community Schools, Ypsilanti

Mr. Nathaniel Reid
Program Coordinator
Center for Occupational & Personalized Education (COPE
Ann Arbor, Michigan

On April 30, 1993, the Commission conducted its national hearing on the topic of Professional Development for Teachers and received testimony from the following individuals:

National Hearing Witnesses

Judith Lanier
President
Michigan Partnership for New Education
East Lansing, Michigan

Dennis Sparks
Executive Director
National Staff Development Council
Oxford, Ohio

Jerry Robbins
Dean, College of Education
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Reform is the Context

Taking as her starting point a theme that Commissioners now find familiar, Valerie Mills, a roving mathematics teaching specialist in the Ypsilanti Public Schools, sought to place the issues of time, learning, and the professional development of teachers in a much larger context: the reform of *all* of public education. "Time," she insisted, is "not an independent variable," but a "precious resource which should be allotted where it will support progress toward effective school reform." She noted two broad reform goals where time can play a significant role: (1) increasing student achievement in basic subjects, and (2) helping to assure that all students will learn.

Increasing student achievement, Mills noted, was the first recommendation in *A Nation at Risk*, and is the third of the National Education Goals. In such basic content areas as mathematics, she argued, learning does require more time in school. "Two years of 45-minute classes is not enough, even for our best and brightest" to meet the requirements of such employers as General Motors. Teachers, too, she said, need additional time to accommodate increased content requirements and changes in assessment techniques. In the face of such demands, she insisted, it is unrealistic to continue to view staff development as an "add-on."

Strategically, however, Mills believed that a decision about lengthening the school day or year would be "premature." The current school year for most students, she noted, is incredibly fragmented by "legitimate time needs that reduce academic learning time for students." One solution, reiterated throughout the two days of hearings, might be "additional work days for staff only and a restructured weekly calendar, with time built in for staff development." The point at which to decide whether to go to a longer year, she said, was when it was known if maximizing learning in a restructured 180-day program had helped students meet learning expectations or not.

Mills saw the reform goal that *all* students learn as more a matter of higher motivation levels than of more time. "Before we add days to a school year that may not be very well used by students who already have an attendance problem," she argued, "we need to look for ways to persuade parents and students that regular attendance and active engagement in learning are important for them." Readiness to learn also needs to be addressed by fully funding Head Start, and other projects such as the Carolina Abecedarian Projects and the New York Mother-Child Home Program, she said.

Professional Development Means
"Time to Examine, Time to Debate, Time to Reflect"

Commissioners were eager to hear from Carol Polkinghorn, of the Greensburg Salem (Pa.) School District because of her leadership role in the work of the National Education Association's (NEA) Time Committee, which has been investigating many of the Commission's concerns.

The NEA's work thus far appears to reinforce the view that "the real issue is not just adding or manipulating time, but changing [how] education is conducted." Teachers, she said, are caught in a fundamental trap. They are still largely seen by the public through the lens of the Taylorism of the 1920s: The only time they "really working" is when there is student contact. The idea that teachers (the "workers") have a role to play in school reform along with administrators (the "managers") is now taking hold, however. Teachers, she insisted, cannot respond to and implement all the necessary changes in their *spare* time; they need to be able to control their own use of time.

Meaningful professional development that reinforces overall reform, Polkinghorn said, had to involve teachers in "on-going interactive experiences" and "dialogue among colleagues." In Japan, she noted by way of example, teachers are in charge of classes only 60% of the time they are in school; they spend the rest of the day in planning, collaboration with colleagues, research, tutoring, and other professionally enriching activities. "Time to examine, time to debate, and time to reflect," she said, were "the single most important and necessary resources for school improvement."

The NEA Time Committee, Polkinghorn testified, would be **recommending five strategies** for ameliorating current time problems for teachers:

- using intervention tactics, e.g., the use of interns, parents, and volunteers to free up teacher time;
- restructuring the school day through such techniques as "block scheduling" and creating "schools-within-schools";
- adopting a common planning time concept for teachers;
- using meetings more for planning and collaboration and less for administrative communication; and
- finding creative ways to "buy time," e.g., using allocated staff development funds for evening or summer planning activities.

Polkinghorn concluded with three additional, long-term strategies for more effective use of time as a component of school reform: (1) make learning the constant and time the variable, instead of the reverse, which is now the case; (2) restructure time to make collaboration with the community easier, through such mechanisms as real-world experiences for students and helping teachers meet students' non-educational needs; and (3) make more effective use of technology as a professional development tool.

Survey Results Showed ...

Sharon Ryles, a teacher at the Willow Run Community School in Ypsilanti, presented Commissioners with the results of an "informal poll" she had conducted among her colleagues as to the issues they felt were most salient for achieving the National Education Goals.

Among **parents**, she said, these issues were dominant:

- improving reading, writing, mathematics, and reasoning skills;
- lowering the dropout rate;
- more help for students with cultural and language barriers;
- stronger attendance policies to combat absenteeism, including incentives for attendance;
- more homework;

- building memorization skills, e.g., through storytelling;
- restricting TV watching and encouraging reading; and
- a commitment to meeting and overcoming obstacles, including internal school politics, changes in school administration, frequent turnover in faculty, and budgetary limitations.

The overriding concern among **teachers and administrators** was to create "students as learners." Other significant issues were:,

- good parent-teacher contact;
- high expectations for students, bolstered through increased self-esteem, high-interest content, a variety of teaching techniques, and assigning learning tasks that make sense;
- smaller class size, coupled with a focus on the quality of time, not its quantity;
- insufficient planning time for teachers; and
- a commitment to the local School Achievement Plan.

Speaking directly to the Commission's charge to examine the issue of time, Ryles indicated that the dominant question of those in her survey was : "How should time be used?" not "How much time should there be?" Especially for children at risk, use-of-time questions seemed to revolve around "extra time" for such possibilities as mandatory summer programs; grandparent programs; cross-age tutoring; block scheduling; more "push-in" programs than "pull-out"" programs; and after-school programs in computers and calculators, art and graphics, music, math, and writing skills.

The Critical Importance of Self-Esteem

Nathaniel Reid's work as a program coordinator at the Center for Occupational and Personalized Education in Ann Arbor gave him, he said, plenty of opportunity to observe the successes and failures of the schools. The most critical factor in life success for young people that he had identified was self-esteem. COPE has found that the most effective way to increase self-esteem is through individualized training directly related to job skills.

With that in mind, his view was that "a longer academic day or school year has no distinct advantage in our American educational system." Too much time is currently wasted in managing

disruptive behavior, which "stems from lack of motivation, no self-discipline, poor academic skills, and low self-image." Teachers would get better results and improve their relationships with minority and disadvantaged students if they received the equivalent of one week's time for training in behavioral management. Reid cited community involvement as another key factor in educational reform, e.g., through personal contact and businesses and their employees visiting schools, and inviting students to their workplaces. "Without these improvements," he said, "lengthening the school day or school year will only provide more time for continued disruptive behavior."

General Discussion: School Restructuring the Focus

Most of the discussion with the witnesses following the formal testimony revolved around school restructuring. Commissioner Glenn Walker wondered whether witnesses agreed that more time was needed for professional development. Mills responded that restructuring could, and should, create more time for professional development activity. Reid agreed, saying that a 180-day year was "fine," but that "teachers should get more time for more professional development any way they can." Speaking personally but not for the NEA, Polkinghorn added that teachers say, "Even if you don't pay me, we need more time, even if it's during the summer." If teachers are to be considered professionals, she added, it's a 12-month, not a 9-month, job.

Commissioner Norman Higgins called attention to an extensive list of intermediate objectives that had to be met if the National Goals are to be achieved by the year 2000, wondering "Can teachers do all this without extending the contract year?" Reid, Mills, and Polkinghorn were agreed in their "Yes" answers. "But," Mills added, "unless we build in R&D time for teachers [into the regular year schedule], we won't be effective."

Executive Director Goldberg's question went to the issue of community differences in carrying out school reform: "Will different communities arrive at different lengths for the school day and year, depending on local conditions and needs—and will perhaps different school days and years be available to different students?" "Yes to both," responded Polkinghorn. Ryles agreed, analogizing the problem after her experience as a classroom teacher dealing with the needs of 29 students. "They're all different. We can't have copy-cat schools if we are going to meet those needs."

"What," asked Commissioner Denis Doyle, "would you as teachers be willing to pay for more time?" He noted in explanation that in Japan, the "cost" teachers "pay" for spending only three hours in actual teaching per day is classes that average 40 or more students. "Would you be willing to teach 5 classes of 30 kids instead of 6 classes of 25 kids to get the extra period?" "That's already happening," said Polkinghorn, "in school districts that are committed to finding planning time for their teachers."

Overall, the Commission received a fairly consistent message over the morning's testimony. Viewed from the level of the local classroom, the issue of time was seen as deeply embedded in the broader issue of school reform, with a strong leaning by the presenters in the direction of the "qualitative side" of the discussion. There was less concern about the amount of time and more concern about how time is used ["learning should be the constant and time the variable"].

In terms of the focus issue of professional development, perhaps the strongest characterization of what is at stake came from Carol Polkinghorn of the NEA: "The best professional development activity for educators occurs when emphasis is placed on meaningful dialogue and reflection among colleagues."

> "I have always thought that 'performance standards for teachers' had such a deceptively simple ring to it. Performance standards for doing what? Do we want the work of teachers to be what it has been, or something different?"
>
> — Judith Lanier
> Michigan Partnership for New Education

With that and similarly pointed questions, Judith Lanier, president of the Michigan Partnership for New Education, launched her presentation on the second day of the Commission's Ypsilanti meeting. Her premise was soon clear: What American schools need is "not more of the same, or to do the same things only better, but something different."

Professional Development Schools

Why, Lanier wondered, ten years after *A Nation at Risk,* after a 40% increase nationwide in education funding, after tougher attendance and academic standards had been adopted all over the country, had the gains (as measured by NAEP scores) been so modest? "We remain a nation at risk," she said, "because our thinking about education remains stuck in the early 20th century." Every other profession, she said has "adapted steadily to new demands, new technologies, and a growing acceptance of human diversity .... except teaching."

By way of answering her own questions, Lanier offered a compelling analogy. If we wanted a horse and buggy to carry more passengers faster, and we kept on trying to improve the horse and buggy, we could: Breed stronger horses, build bigger buggies, construct better roads, or beat the horse harder. "But pretty soon, you come up against some absolute limits. The only solution is to invent something different." It's the same in education. Most of the work is still confined to a classroom; the dominant technologies are still paper-and-pencil and chalk-and-blackboard; the communications system is still predominantly textbooks. "We have not prepared our workforce for a changing world of work and learning," she said. More or even better of the same won't work.

Lanier then stated the crux of her argument, which set the terms for the afternoon discussion: We won't get high level learning to increase student performance without effective teaching; we won't get effective teaching without better professional development, and we won't get better professional development without specific development sites devoted to innovation and experimentation—Professional Development Schools (PDS).[1]

"I suggest," she said, "that each state develop a system that includes local innovation sites, connected with one another and to other parts of the education system, for sharing what is learned." PDS would become the new places of professional education for educators. They would take new baccalaureate graduates with academic (not education) majors for intensive, one-year internships in pedagogical study, connected to community settings. Teachers-to-be would be evaluated on their professional performance.

PDS would be costly, she conceded, but she countered that "huge sums of money now support the sprawling education enterprise as it has traditionally operated, with only meager resources supporting responsible innovation for cumulative, on-going improvement...We need living examples of new educational work, " she added.

Not Time, But Deficits

Jerry Robbins, dean of the School of Education of Eastern Michigan University (EMU), also sought to recast the Commission's basic questions, but in a very different way from Lanier. Whereas she pressed the need for a new beginning, Robbins suggested that the education reform issue had to redraw its angle of vision. The choice, he said, was between a *narrow* vision which saw the mission of the schools as imparting cognitive knowledge to those who could take advantage of it, and *broader* purpose of attending to the wide range of intellectual and social needs of children and youth.

---

[1] Lanier's testimony did not focus on issues of professional preparation. Indeed, at one point she remarked that "The teachers we are sending out are problems to be remediated," and "What student teaching produces is young people who have learned how to be student teachers."

The rapidly changing demographics of American education, Robbins said, argued strongly for the broader vision. Our schools face extraordinary challenges that go beyond our children coming to school unprepared to learn: 1-7% of them do not speak English as a first language, 22% of them are abused in some way, 21% of them are born into poverty. Changing social conditions are forcing schools to take on new social responsibilities, whether they like it or not. The simple fact is, learning cannot take place effectively when children are hungry, abused, unhealthy, without adult guidance, etc.

Schools and teachers will become, increasingly, "front-line diagnosticians and referral agents for a wide variety of social services delivered through the school or at the school site," he argued. In this context, however, the Commission's inquiry into time and learning took on a very different color. The diagnostician/referral role is one for which teachers are not now well prepared, for which they receive little or no professional development time, and which consumes both instructional time and personal time outside the school setting. Teachers, Robbins said, "need more *quality* time for planning and delivering instruction, but also time for diagnostic and referral services." He estimated that a 60% overlap between the teacher work day/week/year and the student day/week/year was needed.

Robbins concluded his testimony by responding directly to the questions he received from the Commission prior to the hearing, highlighting the following:

- **Whether year-round professional development would improve the performance of teachers and students**: Robbins noted that "*focused* year-round performance would undoubtedly improve teacher and student performance ... [and] increase the status of the profession." He estimated that approximately 500+ clock hours went into a "high-quality, institution-based master's program" accompanied by "about 750+ hours of individual study and preparation.
- **Whether universities had a unique role to play in professional development:** "Yes, to the extent that it is important to back away from everyday issues and concerns" in a setting designed for reflection and to deal with broad issues; but "No, to the extent that [professional development is supposed] to deal with 'What do I do [in class] tomorrow?' "
- **What alternatives are possible for financing professional development:** One possibility Robbins recalled from his Georgia experience was that each district there has a separate appropriation for professional development. But, he warned, given the magnitude of the problem, "there is probably no realistic way to get more funding except

by appropriations of public funds or payment by individual teachers with the incentive of a "payback" through salary increases.

Asked for his recommendations on time and learning, and on a longer school day and year from the perspective of professional development needs, Robbins offered these specifics:

(1) Address the "receptive learner" and "effective learner" problems by attacking the social context first, and by using the time gained through an extended day/week/year to work on these issues; a variety of assistive services had to be available at school sites.

(2) Teachers had to become front-line diagnosticians and points of referral for students with social problems, but without making themselves responsible for solving those problems; teachers should receive a few hundred clock hours/year for these diagnostic/referral functions.

(3) As a matter of priority, teachers should receive at least 1,100 clock hours per year of quality instructional time with K-12 students, with the students ready to learn.

(4) Teachers need to have 600-700 clock hours/year for various combinations of professional development and preparation for classroom instruction.

The unexpected unavailability of one scheduled witness, Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers, enabled Lanier, Robbins, and the Commissioners to open a free-wheeling discussion at this point.

Commissioner Shelton wondered whether it was "fair to expect education professionals to be responsible for every malady in society?" Lanier responded that she believed the issue was one of focus, and that while the education professional might be a point of connection or access to social services, the teacher was primarily responsible for student learning.

Commissioner Cross observed that the greatest inhibitor to change in the "schools of teaching" model is in the mind of the public. "How," he asked, "do we deal with moving people away from that model?" Lanier responded with two suggestions: (1) that educators had to work at legitimizing innovation, and (2) that the public had to be involved in making the change, including businesses, government, and local partnerships. "In Japan," she noted, "the family reinforces the school; here, we have to find a way to take up this slack."

Commissioner Jones wondered whether we had to find some way to build the "energy of the entrepreneurial factor" into the discussion. Lanier again responded, saying that "school choice" was not very useful if "people just got to choose from the same old stuff. There is no choice for a different kind of education, only a choice of where to go to school. Just as the 19th century responded to a great educational need through the creation of a new kind of university, the land grant university, "we have to experiment. The PDS allows for innovation through extension."

What was the difference, asked Commissioner Walker, between what Lanier was advocating in the PDS and the old "lab school" idea. "Lab schools," Lanier said, "were for the children of university faculty members." PDS would be real schools, where candidates for teaching credentials would teach under the supervision of those already credentialed and recognized as superior teachers.

A Shift to the Human Dimension

Following the discussion and a break, the formal testimony resumed with Dennis Sparks, executive director of the National Staff Development Council (NSDC), a 6,000 member organization comprising administrators, principals, and teachers. His point of departure was different from both that of Lanier and Robbins. "The human side of the change process," he began, "is often the last one thought of. We're all good at the 'noble ends' part, but professional development thinks of people last; they should be first."

The NSDC, Sparks said, saw staff development in terms of several important issues and trends. The significant ISSUES to be addressed, Sparks said, were these:

- **fragmentation and lack of vision**; the lack of a "systems perspective" and knowledge about "whole-system change" that has characterized change processes in business;
- **lack of consistency** in applying what is already well know about effective teaching and leadership development;
- **insufficient time for planning** and collegial learning;
- **a staff development model based on training-to-task instead of capacity-building for growth**; too little attention to other role groups with significant impact on education (e.g., central office administrators, school board members);

- **a dearth of follow-up** to professional development in the form of coaching, mentoring, and the like;
- **too little attention to staff development in disciplinary terms** (mathematics, science, history, etc.); and
- **lack of knowledge about curriculum standards and assessment** on the part of administrators and teachers.

In terms of TRENDS, Sparks focused on four: (1) a movement toward outcome-based staff development; (2) a movement toward systems thinking (echoing Lanier, Sparks remarked that "There is no point in teaching people to teach new things in new ways then plugging them into the same old system"), (3) a turn toward "constructivism," a theory of cognitive development that says learning occurs not by simple transmission of information, but is *constructed* in the mind of the learner as the result of particular processes, and (4) a change in focus toward the school, instead of the teacher alone, as the delivery unit for instruction.

NSCD strongly believes, Sparks said, that "staff development is *both* individual learning by the teacher and learning by the organization"; Edwards Deming, he noted, "says that 75% of the influences on the processes of any organization come from the culture. Schools are no different." Sparks spoke to the role of the organization in making staff development effective through an ironic personal story. Having gone through a "mastery learning" workshop some years ago, he discovered, on trying to implement what he had learned in his own classes, that he was caught in a Catch-22. The more successful he was in creating "mastery learning," the more trouble he would get into with his principal for giving out too many good grades. "The bell-shaped curve was more important than the kids' success," he recalled.

Sparks stressed that "the very act of trying to make something better is, in itself, a powerful form of learning, because it requires generating new knowledge. By way of example, he pointed out that in Japan, teachers will spend the better part of a day trying to improve a single lesson plan, then invite their colleagues to critique it. "This," he said, "is a powerful form of staff development."

The need for continuous learning, he pointed out, was a lesson that American business cannot seem to get enough of. "In the Saturn [automobile] company," he said, "the rule is that 5% of employee

time should be spent on learning. But that's not enough for teachers and schools. At least 50% of a teacher's time should be spent on planning, improvement, and learning."

Crystallizing the Issues

In the general discussion following Sparks's testimony, the discussion crystallized around three issues: (1) teaching standards, (2) maximizing human potential among teachers, and (3) the use of time and its relation to costs. Highlights follow:

(1) **Teaching Standards**. Commissioner Cross initiated the post-testimony discussion by asking "Why, in all this testimony about professional development, hasn't anyone spoken about the role of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)?"

"Clearly, it is relevant," Lanier responded. "The crucial issue is making the standards and professional development compatible. Everything that teachers will need to be Board-certified will take time to learn, and the Board assumes that will take several years." Sparks agreed, noting that "the processes that teachers will have to go through will be the most powerful form of staff development. Robbins's view was that the confluence of PDS and the requirements of NBPTS will foster a greater congruence between current licensing processes for teachers and the envisioned certification by NBPTS.

(2) **Maximizing Human Potential**. Commissioner Byers's question sought to relate recent professional development among school board members in Maryland as a "systems issue" to maximizing the human potential in educational change.

In response, Lanier called attention to the fact that in the PDS model, the strategic goal was professional development across the board for teachers, administrators, and board members. Sparks saw the issue as "how you *manage* change." "We have to recognize that at the local level, some strategic approaches are powerful and some are not. The people making the decisions are not always well educated in terms of the human dimension," so professional development becomes replicating the past and adding some bells and whistles. That won't work.

(3) **Time.** Commissioner Shelton returned to the Commission's recurring question: "What will these concerns surrounding profes-sional development do to the length of the school day and year?"

Sparks was clear that "we will have to use time better." But, he added, we need to bear in mind that a longer school year need not mean more time in school for children. "More contract time could be used for professional development." Lanier said that "the internships envisioned by PDS would require a substantial investment of time. But even if the time is high-quality, we will still need more of it for professional development. What we need to do is experiment with different configurations." Robbins noted that EMU students working at one nearby high school would not be meeting with students on Wednesday mornings, which will be devoted to planning sessions for all teachers in the school. "The risk the school is taking," he pointed out, "is that at least as much or more learning will occur by devoting this time to improving teacher development."

(4) **Cost.** In this discussion, the time issues also emerged in company with questions about what kind of costs a new emphasis on professional development might incur.

"Change costs," Lanier stated forthrightly, "but it's an investment." She said candidly that she was not too afraid of the cost side of the issue because, "since there is no big pot of money anywhere, the kinds of change we are talking about will give us time to reallocate resources." Asked where she thought the resources for professional development were likely to come from, she said she expected "about a third from higher education, a third from businesses, and a third from state and local governments."

The Bottom Line: Changing the Culture

Commissioner Higgins reminded those present of a point brought out earlier, that professional development required a selling job in the community. Drawing on his own experience in Dover-Foxcroft, Maine, he said that the high school where he is principal spent five months restructuring its school day. Teachers now come at 7:30 a.m. and spent an hour and a quarter until classes began in professional development activity.

The community response, he said, was not encouraging: " 'That's not what we pay teachers to do,' was what they told us." Echoing the main point of the previous day's testimony about the reform context, Higgins's conclusion was that a "big part of what we're up against here is changing the whole dynamics and culture of education."

APPENDIX

SITE VISIT TO CORNERSTONE SCHOOL
APRIL 29, 1993

The Cornerstone Schools are privately supported, year-round interdenominational schools on two campuses in Detroit, adminis-tered through the Archdiocese of Detroit. Annual tuition is $1,850 for a 240-day school year, but no student is turned away for lack of funds. Individual scholarships are funded through a "Partnership Program," supported by businesses and members of the local community, who contribute $2,000 each annually in support of the program. Per annum cost per student is $4,000. The Linwood campus (201 students) offers pre-K through Grade 4 and a middle school program; the Indian Village campus (83 students) offers K-5. The principal at the Linwood Campus, Dr. Norma Henry, welcomed Commissioners on the morning of April 29. After an extended discussion, Commissioners toured the school.

Dr. Henry introduced Jennine Tyrell, the parent of two daughters attending Cornerstone, and an officer of the PTO and John Fife, also a school parent. Both parents spoke glowingly about distinctive features of the school that they believed strengthened the educational program. Chief among these for Ms. Tyrell was the Cornerstone's religious orientation, and the value placed on each child. The emphasis of the school and teachers, she said, was on "love and share love."

The issue was raised of what kind of reinforcement for learning was possible for public schools who do not have the option of turning to religious values. Dr. Henry and both parents agreed that a key to the school's success is that "parents are expected to be involved in their children's education" at a high level. Asked what Cornerstone did when family conditions mitigated against family support, Dr. Henry replied that "we have children from dysfunctional families here, but our policy is that if the parents don't come to the school and participate, the children can't come." If they do not meet the commitments expected (e.g., monitoring homework, providing transportation, attending conferences with teachers), they are "talked to" by other parents, teachers, and school officials. "We have never lost a child because of that child's parents," Henry said.

Asked about the impact of a year round program on the peer relationships of her children with children who go to the public schools, Ms. Tyrell responded that other children were "curious" about hers. "My kids don't have to conform to other kids, and other kids find the summer schooling alternative attractive. They also respond positively to the fact that my daughters wear a school uniform. It makes them stand out; they're different" Her own children, she said, didn't have a problem being in school when other children were not, since "they don't know any other way. "They love going to school here."

Asked what the extra school days accomplished for her children academically, Ms. Terrell replied that "the mind goes on vacation when the body does. If you're in school, you're *thinking*. So having them in school year-round has a definite effect."

Dr. Henry agreed, noting that the year-round program "impacts the 'forgetting curve,'" and enables cornerstone to use educational enrichment opportunities in the city of Detroit as much as possible.

In terms of assessment, Dr. Henry noted that Cornerstone kids "do score higher," but that "more time could not be isolated as a cause for that, since there are so many other factors." The school's assessment emphasis, she said, was much more on diagnostic than performance testing.

Cornerstone has an enthusiastic teaching staff; they never have to recruit, in spite of the fact that Cornerstone teachers make about half of what teachers in the Detroit system make. "Here," Dr. Henry said, "they have a chance to be creative. They like the values-driven environment." In terms of professional development, she said Cornerstone pays for 50% of all professional development costs for their teachers, and that teachers can continue to receive their pay while attending programs.

In accounting for the success of Cornerstone, the parents and Dr. Henry returned time and again to the theme of self-esteem. It was, they emphasized strongly, the key to educational gains, the performance of the children, and the enthusiasm of the children for school. Asked what values the public school can emulate, absent the ability to rely on religious values, Dr. Henry said the Cornerstone model could succeed as a public school because it's success had to do with "affirming the distinctiveness and uniqueness of every child, and inculcating a sense of responsibility in every child."

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION COMMISSION ON TIME AND LEARNING

John Hodge Jones, *Chair*
Superintendent of Schools
Murfreesboro, Tennessee

Carol Schwartz, *Vice-chair*
Community & Charitable
Activities Volunteer
Washington, DC

Hon. Michael J. Barrett
State Senator
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Cambridge, Massachusetts

B. Marie Byers
Vice-president
Washington County Board of Education
Hagerstown, Maryland

Christopher C. Cross
Executive Director
Education Initiative
Business Roundtable
Chevy Chase, Maryland

Denis P. Doyle
Senior Fellow
Hudson Institute
Washington, DC

Norman E. Higgins
Principal
Piscataquis High School
Dover-Foxcroft, Maine

William E. Shelton
President
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

Glenn R. Walker
Principal
Clifton-Clyde High School
Clyde, Kansas

National Education Commission on Time and Learning
1255 22nd Street, N.W.
Suite 502
Washington, D.C. 20202-7591
(202) 653-5019